

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-14, 17-19, 21-22, 24-27, 31 and 33 are pending. Claims 1, 14, and 27 are amended to more particularly point out the differences between the present invention as claimed and the cited references. Claims 2, 3, 7, 10, 15-16, 20, 23, 28-30, and 32 are canceled. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested based on the above amendments and the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-19, 21-22, 24-28, 30-31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,757) in view of Mousseau et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0120696). Applicants have amended the claims to more particularly distinguish the claims over the cited art.

Watanabe, alone or in combination with Mousseau, does not teach or suggest the amended claims. Considered as a whole, Watanabe discloses a notification apparatus that notifies a user of a cellular phone of the arrival of an electronic mail when that user is away from the office. See Abstract; see also col. 1, lines 27-67. Watanabe does not contemplate “wherein said identified wireless electronic device is operable to display received subsets to a user and wherein the user subsequently is able to select the subset; and wherein said notifications server transmits a remainder of said electronic mail message corresponding to said particular subset in response to said selection and thereby download the remainder of the electronic mail message to said identified electronic wireless device” as in the amended claims. At best, Watanabe discloses that a small piece of the arrived message may be transmitted to the user’s cellular phone, if the phone is capable of displaying such piece. See col. 6, lines 17-32. This transmission is not the full message and the transmission does not enable the user to download the remainder of the message.

Watanabe does not teach providing the user with a subset of the electronic message to allow the user to download electronic message of interest for viewing at the wireless portable device as claimed. The Examiner states that Watanabe discloses “to advise a user when an electronic message is received and to provide the user with a subset of the electronic message to

allow the user to download electronic message of interest for viewing at the wireless portable device” through the following reference:

After determining whether the arrived (received) electronic mail is a multipart mail, the mail notification apparatus 100 establishes a connection to the communication vender mail server 105 through the LAN 101 and the Internet 104 (ST409). Here, it is assumed that the IP address of the communication vender mail server 105 is preset to the mail notification apparatus 100. Since the arrived (received) electronic mail is a multipart mail, the mail notification apparatus 100 transmits an arrival notification mail for the multipart mail to the cellular phone mail address 303 in the mail account data currently being read (ST410). In other words, the mail notification apparatus 100 notifies, by using electronic mail, the cellular phone mail address 303 in the mail account data currently being read, of the arrival of an electronic mail and the fact that the electronic mail is a multipart mail. More specifically, the mail notification apparatus 100 sends a predetermined (standard) message with a fixed form to the cellular phone mail address 303b "09023456789@xxx.co.jp", corresponding to "Saburo.Matsushita" 301b, to notify the arrival of an electronic mail and the fact that the electronic mail is a multipart mail. The standard message includes a couple of short sentences, such as "An electronic mail has arrived. The arrived electronic mail is a multipart mail. The cellular phone 106 displays the message on a display portion, such as a LCD display, and so on. Col. 5, lines 6 – 31 (the Examiner also cites col. 2, lines 54-60).

However, nowhere in the above passage is the user device operable to display received subsets of the electronic message to enable the user to select and download the electronic message in response to such a selection for viewing at the wireless portable device as amended. Watanabe discloses sending a separate electronic mail message to a user to notify that an email has arrived in the user's account. The content of the arrival email is: "The standard message includes a couple of short sentences, such as 'An electronic mail has arrived. The arrived electronic mail is a multipart mail.'" This is not a subset of the electronic message received that allows the download of the message as claimed.

Additionally, Watanabe also does not exist in the paradigm of pushing messages to electronic devices. Watanabe requires separate structure to retrieve emails at predetermined intervals. For example, Watanabe does not disclose "said mail server automatically forwards using standard mail protocols the copies of the received messages to the said notifications server." Watanabe teaches the opposite:

FIG. 1 is a schematic view illustrating a network on which a mail notification apparatus 100 operates, according to an embodiment of the present invention. As

shown in FIG. 1, the mail notification apparatus 100 of the present invention is, for example, provided on a LAN 101 built in a company. A local mail server 102 and local mail clients 103, each of which is embodied, for example, as a PC, and so on, are connected to the LAN 101. The mail notification apparatus 100 is further connected to the Internet 104 via the LAN 101. Thus, **the mail notification apparatus 100 of the present invention is capable of accessing a mail server 105 of a communication vender** (hereinafter "communication vender mail server"). The local mail server 102 receives an electronic mail from the Internet 104 via the LAN 101. Then, the local mail server 102 stores the received electronic mail into a mailbox corresponding to a mail address of the electronic mail. The local mail client 103 accesses the local mail server 102, at a predetermined time or in response to a predetermined instruction. When an electronic mail is stored in a corresponding mailbox, the local mail client 103 retrieves the electronic mail. Thus, the local mail client 103 can receive an electronic mail from the Internet 104. On the other hand, the communication vender mail server 105 performs wireless communication of electronic mail data with a cellular phone 106 according to a communication protocol specialized for the communication vender. Thus, the cellular phone 106 can transmit/receive an electronic mail to/from the Internet 104. In the network as described above, **the mail notification apparatus 100 notifies the cellular phone 106 of the arrival of the electronic mail stored in the mailbox of the local mail server 102.** Hereinafter, the electronic mail to notify the arrival of an electronic mail is called an "arrival notification mail". The configuration (construction) and the control of the mail notification apparatus 100 is explained below. Col. 2, lines 24 – 60 (emphasis added).

Furthermore, Watanabe teaches:

As described above, if the transmission of the arrival notification mail is set, the mail notification apparatus 100 monitors whether a predetermined period has elapsed. When the predetermined period has elapsed (ST401), the mail notification apparatus 100 establishes a connection to the local mail server 102 (ST402). It is assumed that an IP address of the local mail server 102 is previously set to the mail notification apparatus 100. Col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 3; see also col. 4, lines 4 – 41.

At no time does the mail server forward the received email, or a subset of the email message, to the notification server. In Watanabe, the notification server establishes the connection, reads a record of mail account data, logs in the mail account, and sends a query to the local mail server. See col. 4, lines 4 – 41. As stated by Watanabe, "[in] other words, the mail notification apparatus 100 determines whether the mailbox corresponding to "Taro.Matsushita" 301 stores an electronic mail." The mail server in this process performs no action, especially not forwarding copies of the received messages to the notifications server as claimed.

Furthermore, Watanabe does not teach “said notifications server, upon generation of said subset, is configured to automatically transmit without any user trigger.” Watanabe states a user trigger is necessary:

To make the mail notification apparatus 100 transmit the arrival notification mail, **presetting is required**. In other words, when a user of the local mail client 103 is going out, **the user is required to set the mail notification apparatus 100 to request for transmitting the arrival notification mail to the cellular phone 106**. To set the request for transmitting the arrival notification mail, flags are provided in the HD section 208, for example. By checking the value of the flags, the mail notification apparatus 100 can know of who needs transmission of mail notification mail. Although it is not shown in FIG. 3, the flags can be included in the mail address conversion table 300. Col 3, lines 43 – 54 (emphasis added).

Watanabe does not disclose a manual activity for downloading the remainder of an electronic mail message because there is no equivalent capability in Watanabe’s invention. This is not a case of simply replacing manual activities with automatic means. The present invention as claimed operates in a different paradigm from the one Watanabe exists in.

Mousseau does not cure Watanabe’s deficiencies. Mousseau, which exists in a different paradigm from Watanabe, alters the operation of Watanabe. Mousseau “is directed toward the field of replicating (or synchronizing) information folders between a host system and a mobile data communication device.” p. 1, para. [0003]. Mousseau requires a folder at a host system and a folder at the mobile device so that the data items may be synchronized between the systems. Watanabe describes explicitly or inherently no such capability. The cellular phone in Watanabe does not utilize folders or storage system disclosed within Mousseau. Combination with Watanabe requires not only for Watanabe to change the principle of querying a mail server for the status of a message, but to adopt Mousseau’s data hierarchy and replication scheme.

Mousseau also does not disclose generating a subset of an electronic message. The Examiner has stated “Mousseau generat[es] a copy of said electronic mail message, therefrom, a subset of said received copy of said electronic mail message” is taught, in part, by:

Assuming that the redirector program 12 is activated, and has been configured by the user (either through the sensing of an internal, network or external event) to replicate certain user data items (including messages of type A or C) to the mobile device 24, when the message A is received at the host system 10, the redirector program 12 detects its presence and prepares the message for redirection to the mobile device 24. In preparing the message A for redirection, the redirector program 12 could compress the original message A, could compress the message

header, or could encrypt the entire message A to create a secure link to the mobile device 24. Para. [0070]; see also para. [0076] and para. [0067].

However, the claims do not state “generating a copy of said electronic message.” The amended claims recite “said notifications server is for **automatically generating, therefrom, a subset of said received copy** of said electronic mail message...wherein said notifications server transmits a remainder of said electronic mail message corresponding to said particular subset in response to said selection and thereby download the remainder of the electronic mail message to said identified electronic wireless device.” Mousseau discloses a method/system that redirects exact copies (which is consistent with its scheme of synchronization of data folders) of email messages teaching away from the present invention as claimed. In addition, Mousseau does not disclose the capability that enables a user to select the subset of a message to download the remainder of a message.

Thus, Watanabe and Mousseau, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the present claims as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the application based on the above arguments and allow the claims. In the event the Examiner requires further specificity to distinguish the asserted art, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain before allowing this application to pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: January 27, 2010

9229 Sunset Blvd., Suite 630
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860

By: /Shawn Diedtrich /
Shawn Diedtrich
Registration No. 58,176
480.704.4615 (direct)